



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,673	11/05/2001	Hartley Moyes	6240.241	4016

7590 07/12/2006

Joseph W. Berenato, III
Liniak, Berenato, Longacre & White, LLC
Suite 240
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHI Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/985,673

Applicant(s)

MOYES, HARTLEY

Examiner

Chi Q Nguyen

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/2/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-20 and 23-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-20 and 23-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the applicant's amendment filed on 5/2/2006.

Claims 18-20, and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch (US 5,766,774).

In regard claims 18, 19, Lynch teaches molded hollow door core comprising a door frame 20, first, second door skins 11, 11a, are attached to the door frame 20 so as to define a hollow core area 59 therebetween, at least one of said skins being a molded wood door skin (see Col. 1, lines 32-34, and 50-51), said one molded door skin having molded therein a plurality of panels 14, 15, (Figure 1) or 41-46 (Figure 2). Lynch does not specifically teach the molded skin door has bond strength of at least about 2.0 and 2.5N/mm², respectively. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed bond strength. Having a specific range of bond strength for the door skins would have been an obvious engineering design choice to provide appropriate bond strength for door skin thus preventing the skins from separating from the frame.

In regard claims 20, 25, Lynch teaches the basic structural elements as stated and further teaches (Col. 2, lines 16-18) wherein each of said first and second door skins is a molded door skin formed by pressing a mat is then transferred to a press under heat and pressure to form the wood composite. Lynch does not teach expressly the molded door skin having density of at least about 550kg/m³ or has a substantially constant density. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed skin density;

Art Unit: 3635

therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the skin density such specified in these claims. Having a specific range of density for door skins would have been an obvious engineering design choice to provide a hardness for door skins so providing stronger door structures Further, since the claim is set forth an apparatus of the hollow core door, and the citation "a molded door skin formed by pressing a loose bat or mat into a wood composite flat door blank having a density of at least about 550kg/m³, and thereafter moisturizing, heating, and reforming in a press said flat door blank into a molded door skin..." is considered a method of forming a device and is not germane to the issue of patentability of the skin. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

In regard claim 26, Lynch teaches the basic structural elements for the claimed invention as stated, wherein further said one molded door skin has an outer planar portion, an inner planar portion, and a contoured portion 12/12a between and integral with said outer and inner planar portion (Fig. 3).

In regard claim 27, Lynch teaches the basic structural elements for the claimed invention as stated, wherein further said outer planer portion lies on a plane that is coplanar with the plane of said inner planer portion (see Figs. 1-2).

In regard claim 28, Lynch teaches the basic structural elements for the claimed invention as stated and further said contoured portion includes an angled offset portion 31-36 (Fig. 2) or 18-19 (Figure 1).

In regard claim 29, Lynch teaches the basic structural elements for the claimed invention as stated and further said contoured portion has a thickness differing from the thickness of said outer an inner planar portions.

Claims 23, 24, and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch (US 5,766,774) in view of Aufderhaar (US 5,219,634).

Lynch teaches the basic structural elements for the claimed invention as stated. However, Lynch does not specifically teach wherein said one molded door skin has an exteriorly disposed side having a moisture impervious barrier thereon and the moisture impervious barrier is selected from the group consisting of melamine impregnated crepe paper, phenolic resin crepe paper, and cross-lined polymer resin, and wherein said one molded door skin has an exteriorly disposed side having a pigmented sealer provides a uniform colored surface. Aufderhaar teaches a well-known prior art molded door assembly including an overlaid laminate of phenolic resin-impregnated paper (Col. 1, lines 21-23). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art to combine Lynch with Aufderhaar for well-known door skin laminated of phenolic resin-impregnated paper. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide weather resistant to door panels and also enhance more pleasing to the door surfaces.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23-24 and 30-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 5/2/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard applicant argued that Lynch does not teach a molded door skin having bond strength of at least 2.0N/mm^2 (or preferably a bond strength of at least about 2.5N/mm^2). Although the prior arts do not teach the specific range of bonding strength; however, as set forth above, the applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed bonded strength, therefore it would have been obvious of a design choice to use the bonded strength range such specified in the claims. Further, the applicant's disclosure, pages 8-9 (as preferred by the applicant's remarks) expressly stated that "preferably a bond strength of at least about 2.5N/mm^2 " would made a better bonding strength than the prior art, Masonite Corporation (1.4N/mm^2). At the time of the invention was made, one having an ordinary skill in the art would obviously made a stronger bonding (greater than 1.4N/mm^2) by providing a stronger bonding material to achieve a desirable result, $2.0\text{-}2.5\text{N/mm}^2$, etc. In regard applicant's newly added limitation "reformed" would have been considered as a method of forming a device and is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6847, Mon-Thu (7:00-5:30), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached at (571) 272-6842. The examiner's right fax number is (571) 273-6847.

Art Unit: 3635

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairdirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197.

7/7/2006


CQN


Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600